Nebraska Information Technology Commission Recommendations to the Legislature on Budget Issues FY 2002 / FY 2003 Biennium

A Statutory Provisions

- 1. Section 86-1502 (2): "It is further the intent of the Legislature that the provisions of Sections 86-1501 to 86-1514 serve to coordinate the state's investments in information technology in an efficient and expeditious manner."
- 2. Section 86-1506: "The Commission shall:
 - "(3) Review and adopt policies to provide incentives for investments in information technology infrastructure services;
 - "(8) By November 15 of each even-numbered year, make recommendations on technology investments to the Governor and the Legislature, including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel, for which new or additional funding is requested."
- Section 86-1510: "The Chief Information Officer shall:
 (6) Assist the budget division of the Department of Administrative Services and Legislative Fiscal Analyst in evaluating technology-related budget requests."

B. Process for FY2002 / FY2003 Budget Requests

- 1. Statewide Technology Plan (project proposal form)
- 2. Budget Instructions (7/15)
- 3. "Interpretation of New or Additional Funding for Technology Investments" (7/24)
- 4. Submission of Project Proposal Forms (9/15)
- 5. Technical review of project proposals
- 6. Review and prioritization by Education Council and State Government Council a. Prioritized list of projects that met requirements for project proposals
- 7. Review and comment by Community Council
- 8. Joint Committee
- 9. NITC recommendations

C. NITC Recommendations

- 1. Prioritized list of projects
- 2. Non-prioritized list of operational expenditures submitted for technical review
- 3. Recommendations on other information technology investments

D. Explanation

LB 924 (1998) provided a broad role for the NITC in setting policy and making recommendations pertaining to information technology. Section 86-1506 (8) requires the NITC to make recommendations on information technology investments during each biennial budget process, "including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel, for which new or additional funding is requested."

To meet this mandate, the Statewide Technology Plan directed all state agencies and public higher education institutions to submit project proposal forms when new or additional funding is requested. The plan defined a project as a time-limited endeavor.

The Budget Instructions implemented the requirement that agencies use the project proposal form for requesting funding for information technology projects. In July, the

Budget Division, Legislative Fiscal Office, and CIO prepared a joint statement to clarify the type of technology requests that would trigger the requirement for a project proposal form. In defining a "project", the statement used the same language as the Statewide Technology Plan. It focused on the concept of "a specific series of activities involving implementation" of IT systems and specifically excluded "on-going operational costs of information technology such as replacement of computers, operating systems upgrades, routine data processing costs, or application maintenance."

Despite this definition, a few agencies submitted project proposals for expenditures that fell within the category of on-going operational costs. Both the State Government Council and the Education Council decided not to include these projects in the prioritized list. The technical reviews on these requests still provide the Budget Division and Legislative Fiscal Office with useful information about strengths and weaknesses on what the agency is proposing to do. In addition, the CIO is available to provide assistance, pursuant to Section 86-1510 (6).

The State Government Council and Education Council excluded several other projects from the prioritized list, because they represented proposals for new, on going programs. This included three new grant programs for the Library Commission and two proposals from the University. All five represent significant policy decisions and require separate consideration.

BUDGET PRIORITY PROCESS & TIMELINES FY2001-2003 BIENNIUM

| DATE | ACTIVITY | STATUS |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------|
| July 1, 2000 | Agency comprehensive I.T. plans due. | Completed |
| September 15, 2000 | Budget requests due. IT Project Proposal Forms due. | Completed |
| September 18, 2000 | Communication with Budget and Fiscal Offices. | Completed |
| September 18 - 20, 2000 | Reviewers assigned | Completed |
| September 18 - October 2, 2000 | Completion of technical reviews | Completed |
| October 4, 2000 | Reviews sent to the Councils and Technical Panel | Completed |
| October 10, 2000 | Technical Panel Meeting, 9:00 a.m. | Completed |
| | A. Accept technical reviews | |
| | B. Identify projects and issues that require follow-up | |
| October 12, 2000 | State Government Council Meeting (all day) | Completed |
| | A. 5 minute presentations by agencies | |
| | B. prioritization process | |
| | review NITC goals and council priorities | |
| | review key questions | |
| | review results of technical reviews | |
| | entertain motions for changes to list | |
| | adopt final list of State government projects | |
| October 13, 2000 | Education Council Meeting (all day) | Completed |
| | A. 5 minute presentations by agencies | |
| | B. prioritization process | |
| | review NITC goals and council priorities | |
| | review key questions | |
| | review results of technical reviews | |
| | entertain motions for changes to list | |
| | adopt final list of education projects | |
| October 24, 2000 | Community Council Meeting | Completed |
| · | review NITC goals and council priorities | |
| | review key questions to guide discussion | |
| | review results of technical reviews | |
| | provide guidance to co-chairs | |
| October 20, 2000 | Distribute lists to joint committee members | Completed |
| October 30, 2000 | Joint Committee meeting (all day) | Completed |
| , | A. Membership | |
| | Mike Winkle, chair and facilitator | |
| | 2 from each council | |
| | B. Prioritization process | |
| | review NITC goals and council priorities | |
| | review key questions to guide discussion | |
| | sequential voting between top-ranked projects from two lists to create single list | |
| | adopt final unified list of projects | |
| November 6, 2000 | NITC Meeting - 1:30 p.m. | |
| · | | |
| November 15, 2000 | Report to the Governor and the Legislature. | |

- KEY QUESTIONS (to guide discussion)

 1. Importance to NITC goals and council priorities
 2. Project justification and benefits
 - - Need and demand
 - Benefit to agency's internal operations
 - Benefit to Nebraska businesses, citizens, and other governments
 - Contribution to economic development
 - 3. Collaboration
 - 4. Technical impact
 - 5. Risk assessment
 - 6. Other unique dimensions to the project

Technology Project Review Process Interpretation of "New or Additional" Funding for "Technology Investments" July 24, 2000

Section 86-1506(8) requires the NITC to "...make recommendations on technology investments to the Governor and the Legislature, including a prioritized list of projects, reviewed by the technical panel, for which new or additional funding is requested."

To carry out this statutory provision, the NITC published instructions in the Statewide Technology Plan (Page 8 of Section 4):

"All state agencies and public higher education institutions requesting state appropriations for information technology must prepare a project proposal for each information technology project. An information technology project is defined as a specific series of activities involving the implementation of new or enhanced IT systems for the sponsoring agency. A project proposal is required whenever new or additional state appropriations (regardless of fund type) are required for implementation. Project proposals should also be prepared for requests for funding from the Community Technology Fund; the Government Technology Collaboration Fund; Education Technology assistance Grants; and the School Technology Fund."

In addition to these instructions, further explanation is needed regarding the meaning of the following terms:

- 1) What is a "technology investment"?
- 2) What is a "project"?
- 3) What is "new or additional funding"?

TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT

A technology investment is an expenditure on information technology to support the mission of the agency or institution. Section 86-1504(2) defines "information technology" as "computing and telecommunications systems, their supporting infrastructure, and interconnectivity used to acquire, transport, process, analyze, store, and disseminate information electronically." Supporting infrastructure includes both the physical infrastructure such as computers or networks and non-physical components such as personnel, training, customer support, and software.

Technology is often an integral part of a larger activity to accomplish a particular business purpose. The requirements of Section 86-1506(8) would apply to the technology aspects of a project and not the other components.

Agencies should contact their budget analyst with any questions about whether specific projects constitute a "technology investment." The Budget Division will consult with the Office of the CIO / NITC on these questions.

PROJECT

The Statewide Technology Plan (Section 4, page 8) defines an information technology project as "a specific series of activities involving the implementation of new or enhanced IT systems for the sponsoring agency." This definition does not include on-going operational costs of information technology such as replacement of computers,

operating system upgrades, routine data procession costs, existing support personnel, or application maintenance. Only when information technology investments represent a new or enhanced information technology system does it require NITC review and prioritization pursuant to Section 86-1605(8).

Agencies should contact their budget analyst with any questions about whether specific projects constitute an information technology "project." The Budget Division will consult with the Office of the CIO / NITC on these questions.

New or Additional Funding

For purposes of Section 86-1506(8), "new or additional funding" will have the same meaning as the term "budget adjustments" in the Biennial Budget Instructions. A project proposal is required if the agency includes the technology project as part of a budget adjustment in the agency's operating budget request. Circumstances requiring a budget adjustment include:

- 1) Restructuring or reorganization of agency resources and services;
- 2) Redirection of resources, and
- 3) All requests for additional resources beyond that necessary to meet the continuation costs of current programs and services.

A strategic change in the use of technology should be treated as a budget adjustment, because it represents a restructuring or redirection of resources.

A project proposal form is not required for subsequent years of a multi-year project that has received Legislative authorization, when there is no change to the scope or level of funding required for completion and when no budget adjustment is necessary.

A project proposal form is not required for projects that are accomplished within the agency's continuation operating budget for information technology, unless it represents a new or enhanced information technology system, which is equivalent to the budget adjustment's test of "restructuring, reorganization, or redirection of agency resources and services".

Agencies should contact their budget analyst with any questions about whether specific projects constitute "new or additional" funding.

SUMMARY

A technology investment in the biennial budget process is subject to Section 86-1506(8), if it meets all of the following tests:

- 1) It is a technology investment;
- 2) It is a project, and
- 3) It is new or additional funding.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission

FY2001-03 Biennial Budget Information Technology Project Reviews

Contents:

- 1. Prioritized list of project proposals with project summaries (Group 1).
- 2. Non-prioritized list of operational expenditures with project summaries (Group 2).
- 3. Other information technology investments (Group 3).

Note: Full versions of the project proposals submitted to the NITC are available on the Web at: http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/nitc/documents/FY2001-03/

Prioritized List of Projects (Group 1)

| Rank | Duning 4 | A | Ducinet Title | | EV2002 | EV2002 |
|------|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|----|---------|---------------|
| 1 | Project # | Agency Supreme Court | Project Title Payment of Traffic Tickets by Internet | \$ | FY2002 | FY2003 |
| 1 | 05-04 | Nebraska Educational | Payment of Trainic Tickets by Internet | Ф | 20,000 | \$ 30,000 |
| 2 | 47-05 | Telecommunications Comm. (NETC) | Remote Control Software | \$ | 75,000 | |
| 3 | 09-01 | Secretary of State | County Website Project | \$ | 130,725 | \$ 49,400 |
| 4 | 83-01 | Nebraska Community College System | Serving the Needs of Rural Nebraska | \$ | 516,899 | \$ 508,999 |
| 5 | 47-11 | NETC | Add DS-3, 45MB circuit connection at Grand Island and Kearney | \$ | 187,272 | \$ 167,272 |
| 6 | 47-12 | NETC | Add additional DS-3, 45MB circuit connection into NET | \$ | 40,800 | \$ 34,500 |
| 7 | 47-13 | NETC | Extend DS-3, 45MB to Scottsbluff | \$ | 64,232 | \$ 62,232 |
| 8 | 47-14 | NETC | Add third CODEC at North Platte | \$ | 58,000 | |
| 9 | 21-02 | Fire Marshal | Web Based Applications | \$ | 301,970 | \$ 8,286 |
| 10 | 05-03 | Supreme Court | Productivity Enhancements | \$ | 723,000 | \$ 100,000 |
| 11 | 47-15 | NETC | Add additional fiber optic channels between UNO & UNL/NET | \$ | 70,656 | \$ 64,656 |
| 12 | 47-16 | NETC | Install NEB*SAT Network 3 Uplink dish at Valentine | \$ | 88,000 | |
| 13 | 05-05 | Supreme Court | Move Training and Documentation Online | \$ | 31,000 | \$ 41,000 |
| * | 47-17 | NETC | Install NEB*SAT Network 3 Uplink dish at WNCC | \$ | 88,000 | |
| 14 | 05-06 | Probation Administration | Client/Server Web Enabled Project | \$ | 220,000 | |
| 15 | 47-18 | NETC | Add second CODEC at Columbus | \$ | 40,000 | |
| 16 | 47-19 | NETC | Add DS-3, 45 MB circuit connection at Wesleyan | | | \$ 40,800 |
| 17 | 05-02 | Supreme Court | Courthouse Access to Court Information | \$ | 22,500 | \$ 67,000 |
| 18 | 34-01 | Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Content (Software portion of request.) | \$ | 100,000 | \$ 100,000 |
| 19 | 27-10 | Dept. of Roads | Preparation for Migrating to PC/WEB Application Development | \$ | 200,000 | |
| 20 | 27-05 | Dept. of Roads | Implement a Capital Facilities Management System | \$ | 150,000 | \$ 15,000 |
| 21 | 27-01 | Dept. of Roads | Implementation of Selected Recommendations from the 'NDOR GIS Strategic Plan' | \$ | 450,000 | \$ 450,000 |
| 22 | 27-02 | Dept. of Roads | Implementation of Selected Recommendations from the 'NDOR Document Management Strategic Plan' | \$ | 500,000 | \$ 500,000 |
| 23 | 27-06 | Dept. of Roads | Upgrade the Department's Equipment Management System | \$ | 710,000 | \$ 60,000 |
| 24 | 27-07 | Dept. of Roads | Upgrade the Department's Highway Maintenance Management System | | | \$ 760,000 |
| 25 | 83-02 | Mid-Plains Community College Area | MPCCA Distance Learning Outreach & Classrooms | \$ | 129,000 | \$ 243,000 |

^{*} Potential duplication of services with Project #47-13 (Ranked 7th)

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 05-04

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|
| Supreme Court | Payment of Traffic Tickets by Internet | \$20,000 | \$30,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The number of U.S. households with access to the Internet is increasing rapidly and now numbers in the tens of millions. Those people are doing more and more business on the Internet. We may be able to increase the collection of traffic tickets by making it easier for people who receive a ticket which does not require a court appearance to enter a plea of guilty and make payment via the Internet. This will eliminate manual processing of tickets, reducing the need for staff and reducing the cost of processing.

FUNDING SUMMARY

FY2001 4.2 Pay Traffic Tickets by Internet FY2002 20,000

- Retain Consultant -Define & document requirements

- Prepare scope document

- Prepare work plan

- Estimate cost - Implement changes if cost justified

30,000

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 7.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 42 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-05

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|-------------------------|-----------|--------|
| NETC | Remote Control Software | \$ 75,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Within the Satellite Transmission Center (STC) at the NETC there are numerous control systems. Until recently, all were old DOS based systems with limited capability. As a part of LB1217 a remote control system has been purchased to control all the distance learning sites using Network 3, and the distance learning systems in STC. This project would expand that remote control system to include control of the satellite transmission facility at the Air Park. All of the NEB*SAT services are transmitted from the Air Park facility. This project would allow additional workstations and the ability to control all of the distance learning facilities (remote and at NETC) from a single redundant platform. The system uses cutting edge LAN and server technology to control and monitor any system from any workstation.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM Hardware | FY2002 \$9,000 | FY2003 | TOTALS \$9,000 |
|---------------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------|
| Software | \$66,000 | | \$66,000 |
| Total Project Costs | \$75,000 | | \$75,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 43 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- The justification/need section could have used more detail;
- The area of impact is seriously limited to little or no documentation of future benefits;
- Implementation section lacks specifics.

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

The NET Users Group, composed of clients from both K-12 and Higher Education, assisted the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission in pre-prioritizing projects before submitting to the NITC, based upon user needs. The Education Council members acknowledged the work of the NET Users Group in making their final prioritization list.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 09-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Secretary of State | County Website Project | \$130,725 | \$49,400 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Secretary of State's Office is requesting funding to increase online access to county governments by following the model used by Nebrask@ Online for state agencies. The requested funding would provide for development, hosting and maintenance of websites for county government. The Secretary of State's Office will partner with Nebrask@ Online to provide website development and hosting for the counties. Nebrask@ Online will also provide training so that counties can maintain and update their sites.

This project will allow counties, particularly those without the means or expertise to develop their own sites, to develop a web presence and provide information and services online. Possible applications include access to agendas and notices, e-mail for county personnel, and interactive applications for such things as marriage licenses and land records and various permits and licenses. The Secretary of State's Office believes that this project will provide additional access to service for citizens and allow counties to provide those services more efficiently.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| 2 web design & training specialists | |
|---|--------------------|
| Annual Salary \$30,000 each over 15 months | \$75,000 |
| Benefits | 20,000 |
| Equipment | • |
| 1 work stations @ \$5,000 each | 5,000 |
| Web server & software | 20,000 |
| Travel & Training | -, |
| Quarterly regional meetings (5), 6 locations | |
| Accommodations (training rooms, etc.) x 5 | 1,250 |
| Mileage (1000 miles @ 0.32) x 5 | 1,600 |
| Lodging & Per Diem (\$200 per location) x 5 | 6.000 |
| Training Materials (75 manuals @ \$5 each) x 5 | 1.875 |
| TOTAL | 130,725 (One time) |
| One web design and training specialist | 30,000 |
| Benefits for above | 8.400 |
| Ongoing Travel and Training | 11,000 |
| TOTAL | 49,400 (ongoing) |

Funding would be from the Uniform Commercial Code Cash fund which has historically derived part of its revenue from county services.

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 6.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 39 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- It is not clear whether the scope includes developing applications, or just training and assistance with basic web sites.
- Very little implementation detail provided. No documentation of Nebraksa OnLine's resource capacity to deal with all counties.
 No documentation of counties' level of acceptance of project.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 83-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| NE Community College System | Serving the Needs of Rural Nebraska | \$ 516,899 | \$ 508,999 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This initiative will permit the Nebraska Community College System (NCCS) to make available in rural communities a wide variety of education and training programs that meet the needs of rural hospitals, agriculture, public safety, as well as manufacturers. To accomplish this task, the community colleges need the ability to effectively inter-connect several locations giving students the ability to totally interact with their peers and instructor(s) using a digital switched network. Through academic planning, the greater Nebraska community colleges will increase income efficiency, reduce cost, and unnecessary duplication by expanding collaborative instructional program offerings through the appropriate utilization of technology. The collaborative program offerings proposed and lead institutions for each program are as follows:

Agriculture - Northeast Community College (Norfolk)

Criminal Justice - Central Community College, MidPlains Community College, Northeast Community College, Western Nebraska Community College

Electronics - MidPlains Community College (McCook, North Platte)

Health Information Management Services - Western Nebraska Community College (Scottsbluff, Sidney and Alliance) and Central Community College

Paralegal - Central Community College (Grand Island, Hastings, Columbus)

Paramedic Training and Electronics - MidPlains Community College

Quality Control – Central Community College

Surgical Technology and Radiology - Southeast Community College (Beatrice, Lincoln)

Nebraska is known nationally for its superb accomplishments within distance education with over 250 interactive distance learning sites in Nebraska, yet, many rural Nebraskans have limited access to information technology in education, health care, economic development, and every level of government service. Further, most of the currently established distance learning sites are limited by: (1) the number of locations that can connect, (2) the geographical region connections, and (3) capacity to offer additional education and training programs. This project seeks to remedy this situation by linking regional areas to a statewide infrastructure and providing twelve locations across the state with the capacity to originate and receive the ten instructional programs listed above. This is an ambitious project, but the Nebraska Community College System is confident that the objectives can be accomplished in a reasonable amount of time.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

FUNDING SUMMARY

Section IX: Detail Financial Analysis and Budget

1 Financial Information by Category

| | | | 1 | | | I | |
|-----------------------------|------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|----------|--------------|
| New or Additional State | | Request for | | | Request for | Future* | Total |
| Funding Request FY 2001 - | | FY2002 | FY2003 | FY2004 | FY2005 | (Years 5 | Years 1-4 |
| 03 Biennial Budget | | (Year 1) | (Year 2) | (Year 3) | (Year 4) | 8) | |
| 1. Personnel Costs | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 2. Contractual Services | • | 1 | • | | | T | |
| 2.1 Design - Initial Cost | | \$ 42.000 | \$ 10.000 | | | | \$ 52.000 |
| 2.2 Programming | | | | | | | - |
| 2.3 Proiect Management | | | | | | | - |
| 2.4 Other | | | | | | | - |
| 3. Supplies and Materials | | | | | | | _ |
| 4.Telecommunications(a) | | 110.616 | 168.676 | 168.676 | 168.676 | | 616.644 |
| 5. Training | | 30.000 | 30.000 | 20.000 | 10.000 | | 90.000 |
| 6. Travel | | | | | | | - |
| 7. Other Operating Costs | | | | | | | - |
| 7.1 Eval / Assessment | | 12.200.0 | 12.200.0 | 12.200.0 | 12.200.0 | | 48.800 |
| 8. Capital Expenditures (b) | | | | | | | - |
| 8.1 Hardware | | \$ 302.083 | \$ 268.123 | | | | 570.206 |
| 8.2 Software | | 12.500 | 12.500 | \$ 12.500 | \$ 12.500 | | 50.000 |
| 8.3 Network | | | | | | | - |
| 8.4 Other - Ref Materials | | 7.500 | 7.500 | 7.500 | 7.500 | | 30.000 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ - | \$ 516.899 | \$ 508.999 | \$ 220.876 | \$ 210.876 | \$ - | \$ 1.025.898 |
| General Funds-Program 99 | | \$ 516,899 | \$ 508,999 | \$ 220,876 | \$ 210,876 | | \$ 1.025.898 |
| Cash Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| Federal Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| Revolving Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| Other Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| TOTAL FUNDS | \$ - | \$ 516.899 | \$ 508.999 | \$ 220.876 | \$ 210.876 | \$ - | \$ 1.025.898 |
| | | | | | | | |

NOTES:

⁽a) Telecommunications cost include line charges to connect each location to the nearest video switch. Costs to Interconnect between the video switches will be assumed by NET.

⁽h) An itemized equipment list is part of the Detailed Budget Report by Region

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 42 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Strengths:

- The project has great merit.
- Risk assessment--The impact of this project would be significant. However, it will take time to bring to fruition.

Weaknesses:

- Outcomes are not specific or measurable and didn't correlate with the measurement and assessment methods.
- Project justification-- It would be helpful to provide figures comparing the cost of traditional instruction vs. interactive video as well as an estimate of the number of students who would be served by this system.

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

The success of the Community College System project 83-01 directly depends upon NETC projects 47-11, 47-12, and 47-13. Therefore, it is the intent of the Education Council that Projects 83-01, 47-11, 47-12, and 47-13 be funded as a related package.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-11

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---|------------|------------|
| NETC | Add DS-3, 45MB circuit connection at Grand Island and Kearney | \$ 187,272 | \$ 167,272 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will allow DS 3 (45 MB) access in Grand Island and Kearney into the existing state (DOC, UNL and NETC) terrestrial circuit. Grand Island and Kearney are very active distance learning sites in the state. They also offer K-12 Pod connectivity. Connecting Grand Island and Kearney into the state DS 3 will offer a path for distance learning within the state of Nebraska. In particular, it will permit an increase of inter-pod connectivity.

The existing DS 3 passes from Lincoln to North Platte and Lincoln to Norfolk. This would allow the towns along the North Platte leg to access the DS 3. This is Phase 2 of the original "back bone" planned and started in the previous biennium. The funding will include installation cost and an annual recurring circuit charge.

It is intended that this project will later be incorporated into any contract that results from the TINA process.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM Installation | NETC FUNDS FY2002 \$20,000 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS \$20,000 |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Annual Operating | \$20,000 \$167,272 | \$167,272 | \$334,544 |
| Total Project Costs | \$187,272 | \$167,272 | \$354,544 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 6.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 41 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- Outcomes do not identify any current unmet need definitively. It is implied that a greater number of classes will be held and
 that more students will be educated, however, this would have been better defined by the number of classes that currently
 cannot be scheduled, etc.
- The milestones have been detailed, however no timeline was identified to give a measurement of achievablity.
- The contract needs to make sure it addresses the TINA plan that could be in place just over a year from now.
- Project should identify the stakeholders and members of the NEB*SAT user group.
- Project alternatives should have been more clearly identified.
- Project impact--The application does not directly address how this project will affect the existing staffing, costs, or funding, even though other portions of the document briefly touch on these issues.

Strengths:

- There are no risks identified that would be associated with the customers that will be using these services;
- Making available any unused capacity or allocating non-peak usage to other purposes would be advisable.
- Technology appropriateness--while there may be alternatives worth considering, the proposed DS-3 solution is certainly
 appropriate for addressing the specified needs.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

The success of the Community College System project 83-01 directly depends upon NETC projects 47-11, 47-12, and 47-13.
 Therefore, it is the intent of the Education Council that Projects 83-01, 47-11, 47-12, and 47-13 be funded as a related package.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-12

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---|-----------|-----------|
| NETC | Add additional DS-3, 45MB circuit connection into NET | \$ 40,800 | \$ 34,500 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will allow an additional DS 3 (45 MB) connection between NET and the Lincoln telephony data switch. This will provide NET a second access into the state DS 3 circuit. NET is the main access to distance learning in the state. There is currently only one connection between NET and the DS-3 system. This means that only one connection at a time can be made between the DS-3 and the other networks of the state. NET is the gateway for Nebraska Department of Education, the Division of Communications, and NEB*SAT. Users of all these systems have expressed great interest regarding access into the DS-3.

The funding will include installation cost and the first two years of recurring cost.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM Hardware & Installation | NETC FUNDS FY2002 \$6,300 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS \$6,300 |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Annual Operating | \$34,500 | \$34,500 | \$69,000 |
| Total Project Costs | \$40,800 | \$34,500 | \$75,300 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 8.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 41 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- Identifying an estimated number of customers/classes would help determine the return on investment.
- The milestones have been detailed, however no timeline was identified to give a measurement of achievablity.

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

The success of the Community College System project 83-01 directly depends upon NETC projects 47-11, 47-12, and 47-13. Therefore, it is the intent of the Education Council that Projects 83-01, 47-11, 47-12, and 47-13 be funded as a related package.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-13

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|--|-----------|-----------|
| NETC | Extend DS-3, 45MB circuit to Scottsbluff | \$ 64,232 | \$ 62,232 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will allow DS 3 (45 MB) access in Scottsbluff into the existing state (DOC, UNL and NETC) terrestrial circuit. Scottsbluff is a very active distance learning site in the state. They also offer K-12 Pod connectivity. Connecting Scottsbluff into the state DS 3 will offer a path for distance learning within the state of Nebraska. In particular, it will permit an increase of inter-pod connectivity.

The existing DS 3 passes from Lincoln to North Platte and Lincoln to Norfolk. This would extend the North Platte leg to Scottsbluff . This is Phase 3 of the original "back bone" planned and started in the previous biennium. The funding will include installation cost and an annual recurring circuit charge. It is intended that this project will later be incorporated into any contract that results from the TINA process.

These costs were based on NETC purchasing alone. It may change in that the University of Nebraska currently as a T-1 from North Platte to Scottsbluff. They have indicated that they would co-negotiate this contract to allow them to expand their current circuit to Scottsbluff. This aggregation of demand is already in effect on the current DS-3 system which is a joint contract with NETC, University of Nebraska and DOC.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Hardware & Installation | \$2,000 | | \$2,000 |
| Annual Operating | \$62,232 | \$62,232 | \$124,464 |
| | | | |
| Total Project Costs | \$64,232 | \$62,232 | \$126,464 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 4.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 38 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- There is no data in the proposal regarding the risk of "not" completing the project. Listing lack of funding as a major risk does not generate confidence.
- No documentation was provided to demonstrate that there is a need for a greater interaction of classes from other parts of the state
- Project's impact does not directly address how this project will affect the existing staffing, costs, or funding, even though other
 portions of the document briefly touch on these issues.
- Milestones and deliverables--no timeline estimates were provided.
- Risk assessment--another risk is that the additional classes or students taught through the use of this DS-3 will not meet
 expectations, and the return on investment will be low.

Strengths:

Technology appropriateness--while there may be alternatives worth considering, the proposed DS-3 solution is certainly
appropriate for addressing the specified needs.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

The success of the Community College System project 83-01 directly depends upon NETC projects 47-11, 47-12, and 47-13. Therefore, it is the intent of the Education Council that Projects 83-01, 47-11, 47-12, and 47-13 be funded as a related package.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-14

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| NETC | Add third CODEC at North Platte | \$ 58,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

In addition to Mid Plains Community College, North Platte is a major distribution hub for the University of Nebraska West Central Research and Extension Center, ESU 15 and ESU 16. By adding another CODEC and associated hardware at this site, we are adding another Network 3 satellite channel to the site. The third CODEC at Mid Plains Community College is necessary on existing and projected NEB*SAT Network 3 distance learning class scheduling. All of the above institutions provide distance learning classes to other educational institutions throughout the state. Because of this, there is currently a severe bottleneck at this site.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Hardware | \$58,000 | | \$58,000 |
| Installation | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Total Project Costs | \$58,000 | | \$58,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 43 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- Project justification-- Outcomes and impact are certainly stated in general, but not specific enough for this particular distance learning implementation;
- Risk assessment-- More alternatives should have been explored besides the choice of technology.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 21-02

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------|------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Fire Marshal | Web Based Applications | \$301,970 | \$8,286 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Many divisions of the Fire Marshal agency are lacking technological capabilities to perform efficiency in today's environment. Many of our computer applications were written for the Windows 3.11 environment that run on stand-alone PCs to carry out our daily tasks. Data is entered into these databases on each PC and then reentered into a "master" database. These applications no longer meet our growing needs or those of our customers. They are also cumbersome to use and maintain. In an effort to improve the agency's efficiency and reduce costs, we plan to replace the current system with new web-based applications and databases, redesign our web site to make it more user friendly and provide Internet dial-up accounts to all employees outside the Lincoln office.

Web-based applications will allow for the data to be entered once into a single database and will also allow for real-time access to the data. Employees, other agencies and the public will have access to pertinent data. They will be able to search for the information they need without waiting for someone else to do it for them. Current databases are on either the mainframe (with limited employee access) or stand-alone PCs. In today's technology environment it does not make sense to develop new applications that are not web-based.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | Estimated Prior Expended | FY2002 (Year 1) | Request for FY2003 (Year 2) | (Year 3) | (Year 4) | Future | Total |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1. Personnel Costs (a) | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| Contractual Services | | | | 1 | | | |
| 2.1 Design | | \$ 65,500.00 | | | | | \$ 65,500.00 |
| 2.2 Programming | | \$ 220,184.00 | | | | | \$ 220,184.00 |
| 2.3 Project Management | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| 2.4 Other | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| 3. Supplies and Materials | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| 4. Telecommunications | | \$ 2,886.00 | \$ 2,886.00 | \$ 2,886.00 | \$ 2,886.00 | \$ 2,886.00 | \$ 14,430.00 |
| 5. Training | | \$ 8,000.00 | | | | | \$ 8,000.00 |
| 6. Travel | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| 7. Other Operating Costs | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| Capital Expenditures (b) | | 1 | <u> </u> | <u>'</u> | ' | - | |
| 8.1 Hardware | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| 8.2 Software | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| 8.3 Network | 1 | \$ 5,400.00 | \$ 5,400.00 | \$ 5,400.00 | \$ 5,400.00 | \$ 5,400.00 | \$ 27,000.00 |
| 8.4 Other | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ 0.00 | \$ 301,970.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 335,114.00 |
| General Funds | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| Cash Funds | | \$ 301,970.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 335,114.00 |
| Federal Funds | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| Revolving Funds | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| Other Funds | | | | | | | \$ 0.00 |
| TOTAL FUNDS | \$ 0.00 | \$ 301,970.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 8,286.00 | \$ 335,114.00 |

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 7.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 40 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- It is not clear what alternative technology platforms were considered beyond Notes and client/server. While a mainframe
 deployment may make sense due to the limited agency support resources, Windows NT/2000 should also be evaluated as the
 server for the application.
- The proposal assumes deployment on the IMServices mainframe but no provision is made in the budget for ongoing costs of mainframe services. The project should also have a checkpoint after design but before programming to determine if the project should continue.
- The needs and beneficiaries of this possible project are well defined. The agency has clearly shown that not only State Fire Marshal staff, but the general public, and other state agencies will also benefit from this project.
- The agency has done an excellent job clearly defining project assumptions.
- The agency has clearly stated the positive impact this project will provide.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 05-03

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Supreme Court | Productivity Enhancements | \$723,000 | \$100,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Court plans up to seven projects to enhance the productivity of judges, court employees, attorneys, organizations which use court information, and organizations which send money to the court. These projects have a common thread - the court data, now stored in 184 databases on 93 separate computers, does not allow easy access for any of these productivity enhancements. We must explore each of these proposed projects to determine where the court data must be located to allow the productivity enhancements to be completed. That analysis requires that we lump these projects together.

The following is a short summary of each proposed productivity enhancement.

- 1. Judges' workflow. The work of judges can benefit greatly from automation. In Douglas County, for example, 5-part paper forms are printed for the use of the judge during each scheduled court hearing. The judge fills out the information by hand; the form is then 'burst' into separate sheets which are distributed to interested parties while the original is sent to the court clerk. Clerical staff in each office types the information into computer systems including JUSTICE. We propose having the judge enter the information on screen and automatically disseminating it to other computer systems and printing needed documents in the courtroom. This eliminates buying and printing the forms, 'bursting' and distributing them, and retyping information. Judges must also be able to use the system to manage cases to know when an event has not been completed on time, to send reminders, to prepare orders, schedule hearings, and perform other tasks which need not be listed here.
- 2. Remote access by non-court users. Attorneys, news media, title companies, credit bureaus, pre-employment screening agencies, investigators, banks, recruiters, and many others now come to the courthouse to access court records. Many courts have a public-access terminal for use of these people, but some small courts must interrupt their work to answer questions. New users interrupt the court staff to get instructions. We must define the information which will be publicly available for each case type and make it readily available in a clear, easy-to-read format.
- 3. Some commercial users, including title companies, credit bureaus, and those which provide pre-employment screening now hire staff to go to each court and collect information about specific cases. These companies have offered to pay for data which is delivered to them in a standard format. This is very similar to interfaces now built into JUSTICE. It is critical to determine what information is needed, when and where it will be collected, and how it will be delivered. Our investigation should provide an estimate of the amount of money which could be collected by Nebraska. We have been advised at least one other state almost immediately recovered the cost of creating a similar system.
- 4. Electronic filing by lawyers. Courts handling large, complex cases initiated electronic filing and were quite successful in creating a usable record and reducing the time and cost of processing the work. Other courts have implemented projects and demonstrated remarkable cost savings. Attorneys now generate pleadings on computers. It is now printed and taken or mailed to the court clerk. The court clerk retypes the information on the pleadings into the court automation system and places the documents in the case file folder. With electronic filing, the attorney submits the case in standard format via the Internet. The court computer system receives the pleadings which can be displayed on a computer screen or printed, and completes the summary information now typed into the court case management system (JUSTICE).
- 5. The case file is thus electronic. It can be accessed by anyone who can access the court system. Agencies can thus eliminate the costly and time-consuming step of photocopying the court file. Attorneys, title companies, or other users who must look at original documents can do so from their offices, eliminating trips to the courthouse. Judges looking for a specific word or passage can electronically search the documents rather than reading the entire file.
- 6. The current court files are paper. Not every attorney or party will be equipped to use electronic filing. Paper filings must be accepted to provide universal access to the courts. The courts must have a way to incorporate these paper filings in the electronic record. Remote electronic access will be meaningless if only a portion of the case file is available.
- 7. Electronic business with others. Very busy courts, such as the civil division in the Douglas county court, have thousands of cases filed by a few law firms. Many garnishments are sent to large employers each day, while executions are levied on many bank accounts at large banks. We wish to explore the possibility of automating garnishments and executions with these organizations. It may be possible to save considerable time and money for those organizations as well as for the courts.
- 8. The initial exploration of each of these initiatives must be followed by an examination of where the data must be located and how it may be accessed. This is the common theme in all these applications.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

FUNDING SUMMARY

| JUSTICE Productivity Enhancements | FY 2001 | FY2002 |
|--|------------------|---------|
| 2.1 Judges' workflow management Contract with consultant to determine needs, produce requirements document Internet Teleconferencing Ability | 100,000 3,000 | |
| Remote access by non-court users Contract with consultant to determine needs, produce requirements document Move data to users who subscribe | 100,000 | |
| 2.4 Electronic filing by lawyers | | |
| Contract with consultant to determine needs, produce requirements document | 50,000 | |
| 2.5 Electronic storage and retrieval of paper court file | 10.000 | |
| update requirements study - may be part of above effort | 10,000 | |
| Previous Douglas County proposal cost likely very close | 400,000 | |
| 2.6 Remote access to electronic court file | | |
| 2.7 Electronic business with others | | 100,000 |
| 2.8 Consolidated work for items 2.1 through 2.7 | | |
| 2.8.1 Consolidate database or create data warehouse | 0 | |
| - Database redesign | 15,000 | |
| - Programming | 25,000 | |
| 2.8.2 Communication changes | 0 | |
| 2.8.3 Train and mentor programmers in new languages, concepts, etc. | 20,000 | |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 3.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 6.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 3.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-15

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---|-----------|-----------|
| NETC | Add additional fiber optic channels between UNO & UNL/NET | \$ 70,656 | \$ 64,656 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

There are currently six fiber optic connections between UNO and NET (three each direction). This project is to install six additional fiber optic channels between UNO and UNL / NET. It will provide for three each direction. The current system is operating at maximum capacity during peak times.

The installation of six (6) additional video and audio fiber optic channels allows UNO, UNL and NET to provide an increased capacity of distance learning classes to educational institutions throughout the state.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Hardware | | | |
| Installation | \$6,000 | | \$6,000 |
| Annual Operating | \$64,656 | \$64,656 | \$129,312 |
| Total Project Costs | \$70,656 | \$64,656 | \$135,312 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 42 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- Risk assessment-- There is no data in the proposal regarding the risk of "not" completing the project.
- Scope and outcomes-- A capacity analysis is needed, otherwise there is a risk of budgeting for too much capacity. The proposal should address the degree of risk that free capacity to users will stimulate demand beyond capacity.

JOINT COMMITTEE COMMENTS

The Joint Committee recommends that a capacity study be performed to establish the need for increased fiber channels and that efforts be made to utilize the off-peak capacity by other educational institutions, if funded.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-16

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|--|-----------|--------|
| NETC | Install NEB*SAT Network 3 Uplink dish at Valentine | \$ 88,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Valentine NEB*SAT Network 3 Dish placement is necessary because the lack of existing teleconferencing systems in the north central part of the state. The only connectivity in that area is the NVCN system. This makes availability limited to the two connections between NETC and the NVCN system.

The Valentine NEB*SAT Network 3 Dish placement allows north central part of the state the capability of NEB*SAT Network 3 distance learning classes. This installation will enhance the opportunities for this region regarding distance learning classes.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM Consulting Dish Installation Hardware Annual Operating | NETC FUNDS FY2002 \$6,645 \$6,000 \$75,355 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS \$6,645 \$6,000 \$75,355 |
|---|---|-------------------|--|
| Total Project Costs | \$88,000 | | \$88,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 6.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 48 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Strengths:

Impact-- Justification is acceptable and if project is not completed, impact on access to learning would be significant.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 05-05

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|
| Supreme Court | Move Training and Documentation Online | \$31,000 | \$41,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Providing training in a classroom for Nebraska court employees is time-consuming and expensive. A classroom must be equipped with computer terminals and related training equipment. The trainers and students must drive to the site, normally requiring overtime and an overnight stay. Costs therefore include mileage, lodging, food, etc. Court employees can access training when it is needed to perform a new task or when time allows to review or cover new material.

Documentation is closely related to training. Copying and distributing documentation is very expensive, and the material is out of date very quickly. Bringing the documentation up to date and providing on-line access would allow any court employee to review the printed description of the system at any time and assure that person has the most up-to-date version available.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | FY2001 | FY2002 |
|---|--------|--------|
| 1.1.3 Provide training on-line | | |
| Determine Requirements | 7,500 | 0 |
| Investigate possible solutions | 2,000 | 0 |
| Hardware for demonstration project | 5,000 | |
| Consultant to set up demo project | 5,000 | |
| Analyze cost/benefit | | 4,000 |
| Develop work plan | | 2,000 |
| Contract to move curriculum online | | 20,000 |
| 1.1.4 Move documentation Online | | |
| Review & update current documentation | | |
| Move documentation on-line | | |
| - Determine project requirements | 6,500 | |
| - Produce Demonstration Project | 5,000 | |
| - Estimate costs | | |
| Hire contractor & do work if cost justified | | 15,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 5.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 7.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 38 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- Both online training and online documentation are mature methods of accomplishing training and documentation goals.
- I do not know if there may be additional communications costs associated with this project to provide reasonable response times to a centralized repository of training and documentation.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

• This project has potential for collaboration with other agencies, including NETC and the University of Nebraska.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-17

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---|-----------|--------|
| NETC | Install NEB*SAT Network 3 Uplink dish at WNCC | \$ 88,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Western Nebraska Community College NEB*SAT Network 3 Dish placement is necessary because of the scheduling conflicts among the Panhandle Station, Scottsbluff UNMC, WNCC and ESU 13. Currently all of these locations share one antenna through a router. WNCC is an active user of the network.

The Western Nebraska Community College NEB*SAT Network 3 Dish placement allows WNCC and ESU 13 the capability of NEB*SAT Network 3 distance learning classes. This installation will enhance the opportunities for this region regarding distance learning classes.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM Consulting Dish Installation Hardware Annual Operating | NETC FUNDS FY2002 \$6,645 \$6,000 \$75,355 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS \$6,645 \$6,000 \$75,355 |
|---|---|-------------------|--|
| Total Project Costs | \$88,000 | | \$88,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 48 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- Project justification-- The proposal mentions current bottlenecks, but does not clarify the severity of the bottlenecks (i.e. how many courses have been turned down because of a lack of resources).
- Implementation-- Project does not indicate timeline for actual usage of the service. Does not address whether there will be
 additional trainging requirements at the remote site.
- Risk assessment-- Customer risk is not mentioned.

Strengths:

- Scope and outcomes--Use of NEB*SAT technology in this case as an uplink/downlink point of entry to the ESU13 pod and WNCC seems to be a rather reasonable solution. The evidence of analysis of other options and the openness to consider them in the future is a very positive feature of this request.
- Technical impact-- Delivery of distance learning technology is a significantly challenging problem in this area of the state.

JOINT COMMITTEE COMMENTS

• If Project 47-13 "Extend DS-3, 45 MB to Scottsbluff" is successfully funded, and is shown to significantly duplicate the services brought about by this project, 47-17, then Project 47-17 "Install NEB*SAT Network 3 Uplink dish at WNCC" should be deleted.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 05-06

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| Supreme Court - Probation Administration | Client/Server Web Enabled Project | \$220,000 | |

⁻ Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Office of Probation Administration in partnership with McCallie and Associates, Inc. developed in 1993 a custom designed database entitled the Nebraska Probation Management Information System (NPMIS 1.0). Several modifications were made to the program and NPMIS 2.0 came to fruition in July 1997. As the Criminal Justice System continues to change to meet the demands of the time, NPMIS has also had to change to support the functionality of the probation system. Therefore NPMIS was again modified in June 2000 and NPMIS 3.0 was published. NPMIS 3.0 is a full-featured relational database program that:

- Provides invaluable offender demographics and related court information to field staff supervising offenders, thereby enhancing caseload management and tracking of offenders.
- ► Provides timely staff workload figures for supervisory personnel within a field office which they use frequently to adjust the allocation of workload amongst staff.
- Allows field offices to have at their disposal a statistical database from which they have the ability to generate numerous queries/reports.
- Allows Probation Administration to have at its disposal a central repository of data from which a number of statistical reports can be generated. These reports are essential in identifying ongoing system needs not to mention program development and evaluation. Additionally, NPMIS is invaluable in providing system data for our required Biennial Report and other report requests from state/federal governments and the general public.
- Assists Probation Administration in calculating field staff workload measurements that are critical in determining respective staff allocations, budgetary requests for additional staff, and the system's overall capacity to deliver required services.
- Provides for a central repository of offender data which is shared with the Nebraska Criminal Justice Information Server (NCJIS) which then becomes available to other criminal justice users to track offenders.

Ongoing program changes within the Nebraska Probation System and other criminal justice entities during the next two years, along with our obligation to refresh the data within the CJIS server, will necessitate NPMIS being again elevated to a higher level of functionality. The Nebraska Probation System in partnership with McCallie & Associates of Bellevue and Analysis International Incorporated of Omaha have designed the architecture to develop and implement a client/server platform that will support the functioning of NPMIS. The proposed architecture is a Windows NT-based web server platform utilizing Microsoft's Internet Information Server, Secure Socket Layer (SSL) data encryption, and a Microsoft SQL-Server database for the probation repository. This architecture would allow probation districts to directly enter data, query data, and generate reports from Probation Administration's central server housed in the State Capitol using a web browser via the Internet. Additionally, this architecture allows Probation Administration to develop and publish a web page that would enhance public access to non-protected data and open an avenue of training for probation personnel.

FUNDING SUMMARY

From the project proposal:

Probation Administration received an unsolicited Request for A Proposal from Analysis Internal Inc. of Omaha, Nebraska advising that their costs to complete this project would be \$220,000.00.

This writer has had experience in assisting with developing the Request For a Proposal for the CJIS server and the Juvenile Accountability and Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) in Omaha. In both instances, the proposals were similar to the architectural design which we have developed for Probation Administration. Several vendors responded to the CJIS Advisory Committee and the JAIBG Committee with similar proposed costs as that provided to Probation Administration by Analysis International, Inc.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 5.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 39 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- While some of the cost savings are not quantified they are described generally and measurement of staff time savings may be balanced with supporting a new infrastructure.
- A requirements definition should be one of the first outcomes.

JOINT COMMITTEE COMMENTS

- This project, if funded, should utilize the RFP process for selecting a vendor.
- The requirements of the project should be clearly defined.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-18

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| NETC | Add second CODEC at Columbus | \$ 40,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

In addition to Central Community College, Columbus is a distribution hub for the schools that connect to ESU 7. By adding another CODEC and associated hardware at this site, we are adding another Network 3 satellite channel to the site. The second CODEC at Central Community College is necessary on existing and projected NEB*SAT Network 3 distance learning class scheduling. The above institutions provide distance learning classes to other educational institutions throughout the state. Because of this, there is currently a severe bottleneck at this site.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Hardware | \$40,000 | | \$40,000 |
| Installation | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Total Project Costs | \$40,000 | | \$40,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 7.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 5.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 50 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

 Scope and outcomes-- The proposal failed to mention the number of customers and more detail on the "bottleneck" that would be alleviated by funding this project.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-19

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---|--------|-----------|
| NETC | Add DS-3, 45MB circuit connection at Wesleyan | | \$ 40,800 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will allow DS 3 (45 MB) access at Wesleyan into the State (D.O.C., U.N.L. and N.E.T.) DS 3 circuit. Wesleyan is not currently connected to the Distance Learning in the State. Connecting Wesleyan into the State DS 3 will offer an additional path for Distance Learning within the State of Nebraska.

The funding will include installation cost and one year recurring cost. After the first year, Nebraska Wesleyan will fund the ongoing expenses associated with this project.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Installation | | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| Annual Operating | | \$38,800 | \$38,800 |
| Total Project Costs | | \$40,800 | \$40,800 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 3.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 35 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- Risk assessment--There is no data in the proposal regarding the risk of "not" completing the project. What happens if Nebraska Wesleyan doesn't have access?
- Project justification--Need for new system at Wesleyan is not well documented. Benefit to other institutions is implied, but not supported.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 05-02

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|
| Supreme Court | Courthouse Access to Court Information | \$22,500 | \$67,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Public access terminals now allow members of the public to access court information at the courthouse. Many people do not know how to use these terminals and ask court employees for information. We wish to explore the use of other technologies to provide information to the public and reduce the staff time needed. There are two efforts - the first is display of court schedules on a large monitor in public areas so parties to cases and other interested people will know which courtroom is scheduled at what time. The second effort is to develop touch-screen kiosks as are now used in Lancaster County. These will provide access to more specific and detailed information.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Improve Public Access to JUSTICE

| • | FY2001 | FY2002 |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| Display court schedules on Monitor in Public Area - Develop and test concept in 2000 FY - Wiring and hardware for additional installations (5@2,000) | 0 10,000 | 0 2,000 |
| Touch-screen kiosk for courthouse - Kiosks will use Internet access - Develop touch-screen implementation (outside vendor?) - Demonstrate and pilot touch-screen implementation - Acquire hardware and build or buy kiosk stand (10 @ 4000) - Install LAN adapter on AS/400 (10 @ 2000) - Install LAN wiring | 0 7,500 5,000 0 | 0 0 0 40,000 20,000 5,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 4.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 35 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

On-going operational costs are not addressed.

JOINT COMMITTEE COMMENTS

- With respect to displaying court schedules on video monitors, this is an effective way to provide information to the public in
 heavily used courthouses. With respect to utilizing kiosks for additional information, it is recommended that alternatives -- such
 as PCs with access to Web-based information provided by the court and addressed in Project #05-03 -- be reviewed.
- Opportunities for collaboration with other entities -- including other agencies and political subdivisions within these public buildings -- should be pursued.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 34-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Content | Ranked:\$100,000 Total:\$300,000 | Ranked:\$100,000 Total:\$300,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The purpose of *Nebraska's e-Library: Content* is to expand and improve access to electronic information resources for Nebraska citizens by providing enhanced access to affordable, reliable, progressive, and equitable library and information services, regardless of economic status and geographic location. This will be achieved through the provision of statewide access to a core group of reference and research materials online, and enhanced access to those resources through the implementation of a common user interface. Other components include shared cataloging using a common database, comprehensive participation in group purchases and contracts through state subsidy programs, and enhanced access to existing print materials available in libraries statewide, using streamlined interlibrary loan (ILL) activities. These will be disseminated statewide through 1) the purchase and implementation of appropriate software, and 2) grants to libraries.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | FY2002 | FY2003 | Future | Total |
|-----------------|------------|------------|---------|------------|
| Software | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | ongoing | \$ 200,000 |
| Grants | \$ 200,000 | \$ 200,000 | ongoing | \$ 400,000 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | • • | \$ 600,000 |
| (General Funds) | | | | |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 2.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 29 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

• It appears that the Nebraska Library Commission can obtain substantial discounts by purchasing a state license for certain databases rather than making individual libraries subscribe separately.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

• For purposes of ranking this project, the Council only considered the software costs and not the requested funds for grants.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 27-10

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------------|---|-----------|--------|
| Department of Roads | Preparation for Migrating to PC/WEB Application Development | \$200,000 | |

⁻ Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will prepare a plan on how the division and department will prepare itself for developing applications both in the near future (1-3 years) and long term (4-6 years). It is critical that we address this at this time as the emphasis is changing from legacy mainframe Cobol applications to PC and/or WEB browser based applications. We must start training our staff and implementing the tools and languages required for this new environment.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimate of One-time costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---|---------------|
| It is estimated that 25 licenses of any | |
| software products needed | \$50,000.00 |
| It is estimated that 8 ISD staff will be | |
| involved in researching this issue | |
| (800 hours) | \$40,000.00 |
| It is estimated that 8 ISD staff will be | |
| involved in preparing the plan to | |
| implement the approved recommendations | |
| (800 hours) | \$40,000.00 |
| It is estimated that all ISD development | |
| staff will be involved in training during | |
| implementation (600 hours) | \$70,000.00 |
| Total One-time Costs | \$200,000.00 |

Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade | \$25,000.00 |
| Hardware Maintenance | \$0.00 |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) | \$0.00 |
| Maintenance & Support | \$0.00 |
| Total On-going Costs | \$25,000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 3.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 4.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 1.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 23 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

• Retention and retraining of current staff is an economical way to attain this goal.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 27-05

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------------|--|-----------|----------|
| Department of Roads | Implement a Capital Facilities Management System | \$150,000 | \$15,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project is to determine the requirements of a capital facilities system. This includes but is not limited to building/yard inventory, building floor plans, building equipment inventory, maintenance work request and work tracking, and facilities maintenance/replacement planning.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimate of One-time costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Application Definition | \$15,000.00 |
| Application Analysis and Design | \$10,000.00 |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition | \$100,000.00 |
| Testing | \$10,000.00 |
| Training | \$10,000.00 |
| Implementation | \$5,000.00 |
| Total One-time Costs | \$150,000.00 |

Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade | \$10,000.00 |
| Hardware Maintenance | \$0.00 |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) | \$0.00 |
| Maintenance & Support | \$5,000.00 |
| Total On-going Costs | \$15,000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 2.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 1.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 0.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 0.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 0.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 1.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 6 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

• It is likely an area of interest to several agencies. This idea would greatly benefit from a colloborative approach with others such as the state colleges, game and parks and DAS/Building Division to determine common requirements and justification.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

• The agency is encouraged to work with other interested agencies, including DAS-Building Division.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 27-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|
| II lengitment of Roads | Implementation of Selected Recommendations from the 'NDOR GIS Strategic Plan' | \$450,000 | \$450,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

In Fiscal Year 2000-2001 the Nebraska Department of Roads contracted with GEO Decisions, a division of Gannett Fleming, Inc. to provide a GIS Strategic Plan. This project will accomplish the following:

- educate department employees about GIS and how it could be used to benefit the department,
- assess the possible uses of GIS within the department and recommend a prioritized list of projects the department should accomplish over the next several fiscal years and the funding level, and
- review the department's current GIS infrastructure, support and development organization and make recommendations on possible improvements.

Because the department does not know for sure what projects will be recommended as high priority, we are budgeting 'contingency money' in anticipation that several of the top priority projects will be undertaken in the FY-2002 / FY-2003 time frame. This money could be used for consultant services, hardware/software procurement, etc. depending on the selected project requirements.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimate of One-time costs (Note: this estimate is per fiscal year)

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Application Definition | \$75,000.00 |
| Application Analysis and Design | \$175,000.00 |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition | \$100,000.00 |
| Testing | \$50,000.00 |
| Training | \$25,000.00 |
| Implementation | \$25,000.00 |
| Total One-time Costs | \$450,000.00 |

Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade | \$10,000.00 |
| Hardware Maintenance | \$5,000.00 |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) | \$15,000.00 |
| Maintenance & Support | \$5,000.00 |
| Total On-going Costs | \$35,000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 2.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 2.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 2.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 2.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 0.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 12 | 53 |

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- There is insufficient information to evaluate the proposal.
- This IT Project Proposal from NDOR does a minimal job of addressing the questions raised in the Project Proposal Form. However, much of this is understandable given the reality of the mismatch of state's IT Project Proposal Form submission timeline and the current NDOR GIS Strategic Planning timeline. NDOR is currently involved in an extensive, agency-wide GIS strategic planning effort, the results of which will determine the ultimate focus of this IT Project Proposal. Because this strategic planning process is not completed, it would be difficult to provide very specific responses to many of the questions in the Project Proposal Form. NDOR is investing a considerable amount of resources to secure the services of GIS planning consultants to develop a multi-year GIS development plan for its agency. This reviewer has been involved, to a limited extent, in this planning process and has been impressed with the scope of the outreach, needs assessment, and prioritization conducted as part of that process. As part of this GIS strategic planning process, specific needs, constraints, objectives and tasks will be outlined.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

• After completion of the strategic plan and prior to expending funds for the project, the agency should present specific project proposals to be reviewed by the Technical Panel and State Government Council.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 27-02

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|
| II lenariment of Roads | Implementation of Selected Recommendations from the 'NDOR Document Management Strategic Plan' | \$500,000 | \$500,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

In Fiscal Year 2000-2001 the Nebraska Department of Roads contracted with Sterling Software, a subsidiary of Computer Associates, to provide a Document Management Strategic Plan for the department. This project will accomplish the following:

- educate department employees about Document Management and how it could be used to the benefit of the department,
- assess the possible uses of Document Imaging, Workflow, and Management within the department and recommend a
 prioritized list of projects the department should accomplish over the next several fiscal years and an estimate of the
 funding required to accomplish each project, and
- review the department's current Document Management infrastructure, support and development organization and make recommendations on possible improvements.

Because the department does not know for sure what projects will be recommended as high priority, we are budgeting 'contingency money' in anticipation that several of the top priority projects will be undertaken in the FY-2002 / FY-2003 time frame. This money could be used for consultant services, hardware/software procurement, etc. depending on the selected project requirements.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimate of One-time costs (Note: this estimate is per fiscal year)

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Application Definition | \$100,000.00 |
| Application Analysis and Design | \$200,000.00 |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition | \$100,000.00 |
| Testing | \$50,000.00 |
| Training | \$25,000.00 |
| Implementation | \$25,000.00 |
| Total One-time Costs | \$500.000.00 |

Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade | \$10,000.00 |
| Hardware Maintenance | \$5,000.00 |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) | \$15,000.00 |
| Maintenance & Support | \$5,000.00 |
| Total On-going Costs | \$35.000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 4.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 2.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 0.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 0.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 0.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 8 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

There is insufficient information to evaluate the proposal.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

 After completion of the strategic plan and prior to expending funds for the project, the agency should present specific project proposals to be reviewed by the Technical Panel and State Government Council.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 27-06

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------------|--|-----------|----------|
| Department of Roads | Upgrade the Department's Equipment Management System | \$710,000 | \$60,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project is to replace our current equipment management system by either replacing it with a purchased product, to enhance our current system with significant new capabilities, or to develop a new custom system. The department is currently defining the requirements for the new system and researching third party products to determine whether to purchase or build a solution.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimate of One-time

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Application Definition | \$30,000.00 |
| Application Analysis and Design | \$20,000.00 |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition | \$610,000.00 |
| Testing | \$15,000.00 |
| Training | \$15,000.00 |
| Implementation | \$20,000.00 |
| Total One-time Costs | \$710,000.00 |

Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade | \$50,000.00 |
| Hardware Maintenance | \$0.00 |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) | \$0.00 |
| Maintenance & Support | \$10,000.00 |
| Total On-going Costs | \$60,000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 2.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 1.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 0.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 0.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 0.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 7 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Insufficient information exists to prepare an evaluation.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

• The agency should investigate opportunities for collaboration with other agencies which could benefit from this project.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 27-07

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------------|--|--------|-----------|
| Department of Roads | Upgrade the Department's Highway Maintenance Management System | | \$760,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project is to replace our current highway maintenance management system with either a purchased product, to enhance our current system with significant new capabilities, or to develop a new custom system. The department is currently defining the requirements for the new system and researching third party products to determine whether to purchase or build a solution.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Estimate of One-time costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Application Definition | \$30,000.00 |
| Application Analysis and Design | \$20,000.00 |
| Hardware / Software Acquisition | \$660,000.00 |
| Testing | \$15,000.00 |
| Training | \$15,000.00 |
| Implementation | \$20,000.00 |
| Total One-time Costs | \$760,000.00 |

Estimate of annual on-going operation & replacement costs

| Cost Item | Cost Estimate |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Software Maintenance or Upgrade | \$50,000.00 |
| Hardware Maintenance | \$0.00 |
| Hardware Replace (annual basis) | \$0.00 |
| Maintenance & Support | \$10,000.00 |
| Total On-going Costs | \$60,000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 2.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 0.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 0.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 0.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 0.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 7 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Insufficient information exists to prepare an evaluation.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

• The agency should investigate opportunities for collaboration with other agencies which could benefit from this project.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 83-02

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------|------------|
| Mid-Plains Community College Area | MPCCA Distance Learning Outreach and Classrooms | \$ 129,000 | \$ 243,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The MPCCA Distance Learning Outreach and Classroom Project provides a mechanism to link through technology the three campuses (McDonald-Belton, Voc-Tech, and McCook) of the MPCCA. The linkage would be multi-delivery (T1, DS3, satellite) allowing for more flexibility in scheduling both originating and receiving classes. The three campuses in return would be linked to classrooms at the four Outreach Centers at Ogallala, Broken Bow, Valentine and Imperial through T1 lines.

The fiber connect between the three campuses of MPCCA will also allow for connectivity to future distance learning systems including the state backbone system. Adding and upgrading classrooms on the three campuses will improve opportunities to deliver and receive classes. Thus, the MPCCA campuses and Outreach Centers will have interconnectivity and will have accessibility to other distance learning systems as opportunities occur.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| FUNDING SUMMARY | | | | | | 1 | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|------------------|
| | Estimated Prior Expended | equest for 2002 (Year 1) | Request for 72003 (Year 2) | Request for FY2004 (Year 3) | Request for FY2005 (Year 4) | Future | Total |
| 1. Personnel Costs (a) | | \$ 35,000.00 | \$ 35,000.00 | | | | \$ 70,000.00 |
| 2. Contractual Services | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Design | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 2.2 Programming | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 2.3 Project Management | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 2.4 Other | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 3. Supplies and Materials | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 4. Telecommunications | | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 4,000.00 | connect char | ges | | \$ 6,000.00 |
| 5. Training | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 6. Travel | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 7. Other Operating Costs | | \$ 17,000.00 | \$ 34,000.00 | line charges | | | \$ 51,000.00 |
| 8. Capital Expenditures (b) | | | | | | • | |
| 8.1 Hardware | | \$ 20,000.00 | \$ 20,000.00 | codecs for T | 1 | | \$ 40,000.00 |
| 8.2 Software | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 8.3 Network | | | | | | | \$ |
| 8.4 Other | | \$ 55,000.00 | \$ 150,000.00 | classrooms | | | \$ 205,000.00 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ - | \$ 129,000.00 | \$ 243,000.00 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 372,000.00 |
| General Funds | | \$ 52,000.00 | \$ 69,000.00 | | | | \$ 121,000.00 |
| Cash Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| Federal Funds | | | | | | | \$ • |
| Revolving Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| Other Funds | | \$ 77,000.00 | \$ 174,000.00 | | | | \$ 251,000.00 |
| TOTAL FUNDS | \$ - | \$ 129,000.00 | \$ 243,000.00 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 372,000.00 |

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 5.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 3.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 5.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 2.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 26 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- This project proposal appears to lack evidence of collaboration and aggregation with other educational entities.
- Technical impact--Distance learning initiatives in the State outside the immediate area of a campus should be undertaken with the cooperation and assistance of those State agencies most skilled in delivery, including the Division of Communication and NET
- Risk assessment-- The risk of building a complex system without integration with other State entities presents a considerable risk
- Financial analysis-- The project may have merit, but clearly, for the resources requested, needs to have much better supporting information.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission FY2001-03 Biennial Budget - Information Technology Review

Non-prioritized List of Operational Expenditures (Group 2)

| Project # | Agency | Project Title | F | Y2002 | ı | Y2003 |
|-----------|---|--|----|---------|----|---------|
| 05-01 | Supreme Court | Administrative Office - Currency | \$ | 176,000 | \$ | 10,500 |
| 21-01 | Fire Marshal | LCD Projectors | \$ | 18,500 | | |
| 37-01 | Workers' Comp. Court | E-Files | \$ | 4,158 | | |
| 37-02 | Workers' Comp. Court | Network Switch from Token Ring to Ethernet | \$ | 18,900 | | |
| 37-03 | Workers' Comp. Court | Internet Enabling Court Data | \$ | 33,000 | | |
| 37-04 | Workers' Comp. Court | Lotus Notes Mail Server Backup | \$ | 28,680 | | |
| 37-05 | Workers' Comp. Court | Server Protection | \$ | 17,280 | | |
| 47-01 | NETC/Omaha Production and Origination Center (KYNE) | UNO Equipment Increase | \$ | 145,000 | | |
| 47-02 | NETC | DTV Operating Costs | \$ | 281,161 | \$ | 904,192 |
| 47-03 | NETC | KUON-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter | \$ | 300,000 | | |
| 47-04 | NETC | KPNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter | | | \$ | 325,000 |
| 47-06 | NETC | Replacement, Fiber Transport System UNL to NET | \$ | 79,000 | | |
| 47-07 | NETC | Upgrade UNMC's NEB*SAT Operations Center (Router) | \$ | 40,000 | | |
| 47-08 | NETC | Move Network 3 Dish in Hastings | \$ | 45,000 | | |
| 47-09 | NETC | Upgrade Sandhills Technology Education Project (STEP) Broken Bow | | _ | \$ | 300,000 |
| 47-10 | NETC | Upgrade North Platte Microwave Video and Audio Transport | | | \$ | 10,000 |
| 82-01 | Deaf & Hard of Hearing, Comm. on | Telehealth Services for Deaf and Hard of Hearing People | \$ | 9,500 | \$ | 9,500 |

The State Government Council and Education Council did not rank these requests because they did not meet the definition of "project" and were therefore outside the scope of the ranking process. This should not reflect negatively on the merits or value of these requests

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 05-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Supreme Court | Administrative Office | \$176,500 | \$10,500 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

New Divisional Printer. The current printer for the division is configured for both Windows NT and Novell Netware which makes it difficult to fix problems. It is frequently unavailable as Probation prints out copies of their database. The new printer will be faster, and the existing printer can be devoted to Probation print jobs.

Automated Fax functions. Incorporate the ability to send and receive faxes directly from the desktop. The current dedicated Fax machine currently requires more time than sending U.S. mail to prepare the material to be sent as well as a cover sheet, then instructions to the receptionist to deliver the fax. It will streamline the process of distributing Faxed material and will allow its display on-screen without printing.

Replace network file server. The use of this machine continues to grow. The current server has been upgraded as far as the architecture will allow. It will be necessary to replace this machine to provide adequate service to the court.

Remote LAN access. This will allow judges, law clerks, and administrative staff to remotely access information from their homes or from the road. It will improve communication with staff members, for example, who are attending meetings. It will also improve service for appellate court judges whose offices are not in Lincoln.

More laptop computers. The two existing lap top computers are in constant use; staff who need the computers are not able to find them.

Upgrade operating systems. Windows 95 is our current desktop operating system and must be upgraded.

Help desk software for LAN support staff. This will allow the technical staff to record calls for assistance, problems, and solutions. That information will also allow the staff to spot problem-prone hardware or software or find areas where users could benefit from more training.

EV2001

EV2002

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | FY2001 | FY2002 |
|--|--------|--------|
| New printer for division | 13,000 | |
| Automated fax receipt & distribution | 7,500 | |
| Replace network file server | 45,000 | |
| Create secure remote LAN access for | | |
| Appellate judges & admin staff, consultant | | |
| to do interviews, determine needs and | | |
| formulate plan | 20,000 | |
| Buy three more laptop computers | 7,500 | |
| Upgrade desktop operating system software | | |
| 120 copies at \$150 each | 18,000 | |
| Select & buy help desk software | 10,000 | |
| Replace Token Ring with Ethernet | | |
| Re-wire Supreme Court space | | |
| Retain consultant to plan new network | 5,000 | 0 |
| Evaluate security of new network | 5,000 | 2,500 |
| New Cable - 100 users @ \$150 each | 15,000 | 2,500 |
| New switches, repeaters, routers, etc. | 25,000 | 5,000 |
| Ethernet adapters where needed | 5,000 | 500 |
| • | | |

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 6.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 3.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 6.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 3.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 27 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

• As this project is a collection of several separate projects it is somewhat difficult to rate them as some are straight forward and some need some explaination.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 21-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------|----------------|----------|--------|
| Fire Marshal | LCD Projectors | \$18,500 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Training Division conducts classes throughout the state for emergency responders and related professionals. The Training Division staff have developed or updated training curriculum to produce more student involvement and informative graphics by using Microsoft PowerPoint and other simulation software. Other methods of producing a sense of virtual reality has been accomplished with digital pictures, which is incorporated into certain specialized training classes. The LCD projectors need the capability of projecting clean and clear pictures for these classes, and therefore the resolution of the projectors becomes very important to a quality course presentation. These new projectors will have the resolution compression capability to work with the computers that are of a 1024x768 resolution.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Projectors TOTAL COSTS | FY2002 \$18,500 \$18,500 |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| General Fund Total | \$18,500 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 38 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 37-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | E-Files | \$4,158 | |

⁻ Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The E-Files project will implement a computer environment for electronic storing and retrieving of Court files.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Domino.Doc Client Licenses - Initial License (66 @ \$41) | \$2,706 |
|--|---------|
| Domino.Doc Client Annual Renewals (66 @ \$22) | \$1,452 |
| Total: | \$4,158 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 2.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 1.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 26 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

 More information about this project will be developed during the Research and Testing pilot to be completed by the agency working with IMServices.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 37-02

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------------------|--|----------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | Network Switch from Token Ring to Ethernet | \$18,900 | |

⁻ Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project moves the Court off the Token Ring protocol to a high speed Ethernet protocol.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Network Card Replacements (80 @ \$100) | \$ 8,000 |
|--|----------|
| Router and Hub Replacements (7 @ \$1,200) | 8,400 |
| State Department of Communications and PCLan Personnel | 2,500 |
| Total: | 18,900 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 39 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Strengths:

• The technical impact of this solution fits with the state strategy.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 37-03

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | Internet Enabling Court Data | \$33,000 | |

⁻ Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project upgrades Oracle Server Database Licenses for real-time access to the information in these databases via the Internet.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Oracle Server Power Unit Licensing,
Power Units(2 CPUs x 750 MHz) x \$22/PU
(1500 @ \$22)
Total:

\$33,000 \$33,000

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 4.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 4.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 6.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 34 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

• While the proposal describes a need for licensing for Internet access to data there is no clear discussion of the types of data, timelines to implement access, or a discussion of need.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 37-04

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | Lotus Notes Mail Server Backup | \$28,680 | |

⁻ Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will provide hot-standby and fail-safe recovery of the Court's Lotus Notes Mail Server and Discussion Databases.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| Domino Enterprise Server License on Two Servers, 1st Yr (2 @ \$3,200) | \$ 6,400.00 |
|---|-------------|
| Domino Enterprise Server License on Two Servers, 2nd Yr + (2 @ \$3,200) | \$ 6,400.00 |
| Microsoft NT Server Operating System, 5 User (1 @ \$500) | \$ 500.00 |
| AntiVirus Software, Two Servers, 1st year (2 @ \$250) | \$ 500.00 |
| AntiVirus Software, Two Servers, 2nd yr + (2 @ \$250) | \$ 500.00 |
| Secure Socket Layer (SSL) on Two Servers, 1st Yr (2 @ \$250) | \$ 500.00 |
| Secure Socket Layer (SSL) on Two Servers, 2nd Yr + (2 @ \$500) | \$ 1,000.00 |
| Server Hardware, (Replace every four years) | \$10,000.00 |
| IMServices Data Center Hosting (24 @ \$120) | \$ 2,880.00 |
| Total: | \$28,680.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 6.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 44 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

• A cost of over \$500 per Notes user within the agency seems expensive.

Strengths:

• This is not a new approach and has likely been done before in our environment and experience.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 37-05

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------|--------|
| Workers' Compensation Court | Server Protection | \$17,280 | |

\$17,280.00

\$17,280.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project provides for moving of Court Servers into the IMServices "Server Farm".

FUNDING SUMMARY

IMServices Data Center Hosting - 144(6 Servers/Mhz x 24mths) x \$120 Total:

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 7.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.7 | 5 |
| | 47 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

• The budget does not seem to include one-time installation costs.

⁻ Financial estimate not broken down by fiscal year.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------|--------|
| NETC/KYNE | UNO Equipment Increase | \$145,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Omaha Production and Origination Center currently uses analog videotape and a disk based playback system (built from a non-linear editor with software written in-house) to originate programming on KYNE-TV. The Video Server will replace all or part of these. The Video Server is broadcast equipment that includes information technology only as an embedded hardware/software system invisible to the user.

FUNDING SUMMARY FY 2002

Hardware & Installation \$145,000

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 44 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- More specificity needed in the projected outcomes and assessment methods;
- Lacking target dates in milestones;
- More specifics needed in the risk assessment section;
- Needs (viewership affected and dissatisfaction with present video quality) could have been identified.
- Explanation of economic impact: Would newer equipment provide cost savings in avoided repair costs or personnel repair savings?
- Project preferability: No explanation was provided.
- Mandates: Does the present analog equipment fail to comply with FCC technical requirements, thereby necessitating an immediate changeover?

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-02

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---------------------|------------|------------|
| NETC | DTV Operating Costs | \$ 281,161 | \$ 904,192 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project provides funding for increased operating costs related to digital television (DTV).

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has mandated that all television broadcast licensees begin transmitting a DTV signal no later than May 1, 2003. The NITC previously addressed the Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission's DTV project. Thanks to funding provided by the legislature and governor the last biennium, NETC is adequately funded for equipment needed to meet the May 1, 2003 DTV broadcast deadline. (Some shortfall remains for production equipment funding).

The FCC mandate requires that broadcast of the analog, NTSC (current) signal be maintained through 2006 or until at least 85% of the area market is equipped with digital receivers, whichever occurs later. As a result, NET will incur utilities, maintenance and other operating costs directly related to the FCC mandate, without achieving savings that would be available if the NTSC broadcasts were eliminated immediately.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| DTV OPERATING SUMMARY | F١ | Y 2002 | FY 2003 |
|--------------------------------|----|---------|-----------|
| Insurance Premiums | \$ | 8,686 | \$ 11,568 |
| Transmission Communications: | \$ | - | \$ 30,300 |
| Transmission Electrical | \$ | 164,903 | \$416,298 |
| Transmission Mat'l/Maintenance | \$ | 62,572 | \$176,732 |
| Partnership Operating Lease | \$ | 25,000 | \$ 25,000 |
| Retransmission Maintenance | \$ | = | \$149,793 |
| Production Maintenance | \$ | = | \$ 72,500 |
| DTV Travel & Training | \$ | 20,000 | \$ 22,000 |
| TOTALS: | \$ | 281,161 | \$904,192 |
| FUNDING SOURCE: | | | |
| Cash Fund | \$ | 25,000 | \$ 25,000 |
| General Fund | \$ | 256,161 | \$879,192 |
| TOTAL FUNDING | \$ | 281,161 | \$904,192 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 7.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 5.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 43 | 53 |

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- Plans for staff development and maintenance could have been more specific. More specificity on risk assessment section.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-03

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|--------------------------------------|------------|--------|
| NETC | KUON-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter | \$ 300,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will replace the existing KUON-TV transmitter near Lincoln, NE. The replacement is necessary for Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) to continue to provide public educational television programming to Lincoln, and the eastern part of Nebraska. The current transmitter is 20 years old and approaching the end of it's useful life. The transmitter uses costly tubes needing periodic replacement. A new solid state transmitter will use transistors, eliminating the costly tube replacements. Parts for the current transmitter are becoming difficult to obtain on a timely basis, and are very costly. As the transmitter ages, the need for replacement parts increases.

When the NETC eliminates NTSC transmissions in favor of DTV in the Lincoln area per FCC regulations, the new transmitter will easily convert to digital. This is expected to occur sometime after 2006. The current transmitter is becoming problematic, and will not convert to digital at all.

The Commission anticipates funding for 50% of the equipment cost from the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | PTFP FUNDS | NETC FY2002 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Transmitter | \$260,000.00 | \$260,000.00 | \$520,000.00 |
| Installation | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 30,000.00 |
| Electrical System | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 20,000.00 |
| Cooling System | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 30,000.00 |
| Total Project Costs | \$300,000.00 | \$300,000.00 | \$600,000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 47 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- Milestones lacked dates as when objectives are expected to be achieved;
- Technology description was vague;
- Project justification failed to address alternatives.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-04

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|--------------------------------------|------------|--------|
| NETC | KPNE-TV NTSC Replacement Transmitter | \$ 325,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will replace the existing KPNE-TV transmitter near North Platte, NE. The replacement is necessary for Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission (NETC) to continue to provide public educational television programming to North Platte, and the west central part of Nebraska. The current transmitter is 20 years old and approaching the end of it's useful life. The transmitter uses costly tubes needing periodic replacement. A new solid state transmitter will use transistors, eliminating the costly tube replacements. Parts for the current transmitter are becoming difficult to obtain on a timely basis, and are very costly. As the transmitter ages, the need for replacement parts increases.

When the NETC eliminates NTSC transmissions in favor of DTV only in the North Platte area per FCC regulations, the new transmitter will easily convert to digital. This is expected to occur sometime after 2006. The current transmitter is becoming problematic, and will not convert to digital at all.

The Commission anticipates funding for 50% of the equipment cost from the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | PTFP FUNDS | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Transmitter | \$280,500.00 | \$280,500.00 | \$561,000.00 |
| Installation | 15,000.00 | 15,000.00 | 30,000.00 |
| Electrical System | 12,000.00 | 12,000.00 | 24,000.00 |
| Cooling System | 17,500.00 | 17,500.00 | 35,000.00 |
| Total Project Costs | \$325,000.00 | \$325,000.00 | \$650,000.00 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 47 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- Project impact lacked specificity;
- Projected dates should have included milestones;
- Project impact failed to address alternatives.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-06

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---|-----------|--------|
| NETC | Replacement of fiber transport system, UNL to NET | \$ 79,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The current Fiber Transport system from the UNL city campus to the Terry Carpenter building on the UNL east campus carries distance learning classes and television programming. Although the fiber optic cable infrastructure itself is fine, the terminal equipment at each end of the cables is not. Fiber optic transmitters and receivers in the system are no longer supported by the manufacturer. Parts are almost impossible to obtain, and expansion is limited due to no new units available. If one of the units breaks, that classroom would be unavailable for days or weeks since no backup units are available. The part would have to be shipped to the manufacturer for repair.

Replacement allows NETC to continue to provide the distance learning classes from UNL to other institutions and businesses, and allows the Nebraska ETV Network to televise cultural and sporting events from the Lied Center, the Coliseum, Memorial stadium, and the Devaney Center.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Hardware | \$79,000 | | \$79,000 |
| Total Project Costs | \$79,000 | | \$79,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 8.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.3 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 40 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- There is no timeline on the milestones.
- Very minimal support material describing implementation.

Strengths:

Project request appears to be a natural progression on the need for increased bandwidth and access.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-07

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---|-----------|--------|
| NETC | Upgrade UNMC's NEB*SAT Operations Center (Router) | \$ 40,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will upgrade the existing router system at UNMC. The distance learning control center at UNMC is the main switching location for all Omaha distance learning traffic. The upgrade of the UNMC's NEB*SAT Operations Center Router is necessary because of the existing equipment age and the complexity of UNMC's NEB*SAT Operations Center. The current system has been supplemented and patched for several years.

The upgrade allows UNMC to continue to provide distance learning classes to other educational institutions throughout the state, and UNMC's NEB*SAT Operations Center Network to expand their capabilities.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Router | \$40,000 | | \$40,000 |
| Installation | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Total Project Costs | \$40,000 | | \$40,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 7.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 40 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Weaknesses:

- Need/justification section suggests broader advantage to K12, NDE, etc, but does not cite any examples.
- The project should include a capacity analysis to insure the proper size of router and to determine the risk of exceeding capacity.

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

Several members commented that the UNMC router supports the entire Omaha educational community that includes K-12, Children's Hospital, Creighton University, Metro Community College, Veterans Administration, and NVCN.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-08

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| NETC | Move Network 3 Dish in Hastings | \$ 45,000 | |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The project would move the satellite dish from Hastings College to Central Community College. The current system is installed at Hastings College. The primary user of the system is Central Community College located four (4) miles away. There are microwave and fiber transmission systems between them. The fiber link has been cut several times in the past, and has caused numerous outages. In addition to the fiber failures, the distance from NET technical personnel at Central Community College requires significant additional time for simple operational adjustments.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 | TOTALS |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Hardware | \$26,847 | | \$26,847 |
| Installation | \$18,153 | | \$18,153 |
| Annual Operating | | | |
| Total Project Costs | \$45,000 | | \$45,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 6.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 50 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Strengths:

Risk assessment-- Justification is acceptable and if project is not completed, impact on learning could be moderate to significant.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-09

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|--|--------|------------|
| NETC | Upgrade Sandhills Technology Education Project (STEP) Broken Bow | | \$ 300,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The upgrade of the Sandhills Technology Education Project (STEP) system is keeping current the original 'POD' that NEB*SAT and NETC funded to demonstrate the feasibility to of establishing an interactive distance learning system between schools. This original 'Pod' was installed as an analog pod and the uplink in Broken Bow allows the STEP Pod to interconnect with the state network via NEB*SAT. This STEP Pod needs to replace equipment. The manufacturer no long manufactures nor supports the equipment. The technology in use is unlike any of the other K-12 consortia around the state. This upgrade would give them the same technology as all the other digital pods. The original STEP Pod was five schools, but 4 more schools were added in 1997 for a total of nine schools.

NETC is recommending a digital replacement. The current system is an analog island and the Broken Bow uplink is the single gateway to the state distance learning system. The telephone company leases fiber optic circuits to the schools. The fiber equipment was installed by NETC for the STEP pod. An NETC employee maintains the equipment with support from the schools in the STEP Pod.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM Hardwai Install Other | lation | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 \$300,000 | TOTALS \$300,000 |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Total Pro | oject Costs | | \$300,000 | \$300,000 |
| Detail: | DV6000 Chassis (x 10) 10 Bit Encoder / Decoder (: 1310/1550 Wave Division I Optelcom Fiber Transmitte Optelcom Fiber Receiver (x Power Supply (x 20) Cable & Connectors | Mux ['] (x 20) r (x 20) | \$142,115 \$ 53,000 \$ 20,000 \$ 59,000 \$ 24,600 \$ 800 \$ 485 | |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 7.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 4.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 47 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

EDUCATION COUNCIL COMMENTS

- The Council members felt that it was important to move the STEP pod to the emerging standards for digital video and not to the current digital video compression (J-peg).
- The Council members asked that the NITC Technical Panel help to define what the video compression standard will be so that some of the current providers (telephone and cable companies) can be strongly encouraged to move to the new standards.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 47-10

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------|--|--------|-----------|
| NETC | Upgrade North Platte Microwave Audio and Video Transport | | \$ 10,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The upgrade of the North Platte Microwave Video and Audio Transport is necessary because of the existing equipment technical quality. The current system uses analog television frequency modulation and demodulation. The new system would use digital delivery via fiber optic cable to eliminate terrestrial interference and degradation of signal due to weather.

The upgrade allows North Platte to continue to provide distance learning classes to other educational institutions throughout the state. This will also allow North Platte NEB*SAT Operations Center Network to increase the quality and reliability of their signal.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| ITEM Hardware Installation | NETC FUNDS FY2002 | NETC FUNDS FY2003 \$10,000 | TOTALS \$10,000 |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Other Total Project Costs | | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| Detail: | Optelecom 5057TT Fiber Optic Transmitter Optelecom 505RR Fiber Optic Receiver (X2 Optelecom 9015PS Power Supply (X2) Cable Conduit FODSTC Fiber Optic Cable | (X2) \$5,900 | \$10,000 |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 9.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 9.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 5.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 50 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Strengths:

 Any time we move from high maintenance, high vulnerability systems to low maintenance, long life cycle solutions, it is certainly in the best interest of the State to expend reasonable resources to do so.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 82-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------|---------|
| Deaf & Hard of Hearing, Comm. on | Telehealth Services for Deaf and Hard of Hearing People | \$9,500 | \$9,500 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Through the advent of Telemedicine, various technology mediums are being tried to determine the most effect method to provide services to deaf and hard of hearing people in Western Nebraska. The Commission is conducting a pilot project to determine if video conferencing and using phone lines to transmit audio and picture to another location are a viable medium for the transmission of sign language communication.

In 1999, the Commission was awarded a \$40,000 innovation grant from ValueOptions to pilot a program for counseling deaf and hard of hearing children and adults through video transmissions to under served areas of the state. A component of this grant is to assess the effectiveness of this technology medium in communicating with deaf and hard of hearing people. The pilot is testing various video mediums while mental health specialists conduct therapy sessions. The specialists must be capable of communicating in sign language and understanding the psychological aspects of hearing loss. The major thrust of the project is to serve the Western part of the state and rural communities lacking specialists.

The goal of the project is to provide mental health training, education and specialists who communicate in sign language and are knowledgeable in deafness and hearing loss through technology (video mediums) to deaf and hard of hearing people targeting remote areas.

Obj. 1.0 To use existing equipment to determine the most viable telecommunications system for communicating with deaf and hard of hearing people.

Obj. 2.0 To offer distance counseling using a specialist in hearing loss and deafness.

Obj. 3.0 To promote access for hard of hearing people, who do not use sign language, allowing them to see the lips and hear the voice of a counseling specialist, knowledgeable about hearing loss.

Obj. 4.0 To offer sign language interpreter services for individuals who prefer to choose a counselor that does not sign.

(The counselor would speak and the interpreter would be transmitting from another location).

Obj. 5.0 To conduct quarterly prevention education programs to consumers.

Obj. 6.0 To encourage and train on the use of Telemedicine to deaf and hard of hearing people.

Obj. 7.0 To offer four educational seminars to counselors.

FUNDING SUMMARY _

| | Estimated Prior Expended | Request for FY2002 (Year 1) | Request for FY2003 (Year 2) | (Year 3) | (Year 4) | Future | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1. Personnel Costs (a) | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 2. Contractual Services | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Design | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 2.2 Programming | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 2.3 Project Management | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 2.4 Other | \$ 7,730.00 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 17,730.00 |
| 3. Supplies and Materials | \$ 1,300.00 | | | | | | \$ 1,300.00 |
| 4. Telecommunications | \$ 8,200.00 | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 7,500.00 | \$ 45,700.00 |
| 5. Training | \$ 1,230.00 | | | | | | \$ 1,230.00 |
| 6. Travel | \$ 1,540.00 | | | | | | \$ 1,540.00 |
| 7. Other Operating Costs | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 8. Capital Expenditures (b) | • | • | • | | • | • | • |
| 8.1 Hardware | \$ 20,000.00 | | | | | | \$ 20,000.00 |
| 8.2 Software | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 8.3 Network | | | | | | | \$ - |
| 8.4 Other | | | | | | | \$ - |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ 40,000.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 87,500.00 |
| General Funds | | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 47,500.00 |
| Cash Funds | \$ 40,000.00 | | | | | | \$ 40,000.00 |
| Federal Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| Revolving Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| Other Funds | | | | | | | \$ - |
| TOTAL FUNDS | \$ 40,000.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 9,500.00 | \$ 87,500.00 |

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 2.0 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 4.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 2.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 4.3 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 1.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 17 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

• There is insufficient information to evaluate this proposal.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

• This project would be a proof-of-concept trial to determine the effectiveness of utilizing these technologies.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission FY2001-03 Biennial Budget - Information Technology Review

Other Information Technology Investments (Group 3)

| Project # | Agency | Project Title | | FY2002 | | FY2003 | |
|-----------|------------------------|---|----|-----------|----|-----------|--|
| 34-01 | Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Content (Grants portion of request) | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | 200,000 | |
| 34-02 | Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Infrastructure | \$ | 250,000 | \$ | 250,000 | |
| 34-03 | Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Training | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 50,000 | |
| 51-01 | University of Nebraska | Public Service/Engagement | \$ | 300,000 | \$ | 300,000 | |
| 51-02 | University of Nebraska | Extended/Distance Education | \$ | 1,975,000 | \$ | 1,975,000 | |

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 34-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Content | Ranked:\$100,000 Total:\$300,000 | Ranked:\$100,000 Total:\$300,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The purpose of *Nebraska's e-Library: Content* is to expand and improve access to electronic information resources for Nebraska citizens by providing enhanced access to affordable, reliable, progressive, and equitable library and information services, regardless of economic status and geographic location. This will be achieved through the provision of statewide access to a core group of reference and research materials online, and enhanced access to those resources through the implementation of a common user interface. Other components include shared cataloging using a common database, comprehensive participation in group purchases and contracts through state subsidy programs, and enhanced access to existing print materials available in libraries statewide, using streamlined interlibrary loan (ILL) activities. These will be disseminated statewide through 1) the purchase and implementation of appropriate software, and 2) grants to libraries.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | FY2002 | FY2003 | Future | Total |
|-----------------|------------|------------|---------|------------|
| Software | \$ 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | ongoing | \$ 200,000 |
| Grants | \$ 200,000 | \$ 200,000 | ongoing | \$ 400,000 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 | • • | \$ 600,000 |
| (General Funds) | | | | |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 7.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 2.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 5.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 4.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 29 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

• It appears that the Nebraska Library Commission can obtain substantial discounts by purchasing a state license for certain databases rather than making individual libraries subscribe separately.

STATE GOVERNMENT COUNCIL COMMENTS

• For purposes of ranking this project, the Council only considered the software costs and not the requested funds for grants.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 34-02

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Infrastructure | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The purpose of the project is to ensure equitable access to information technology, regardless of geographic location, economic circumstances, or size of community.

The purpose of *Nebraska's e-Library: Infrastructure* is to equip Nebraska's public libraries with adequate information technology software and connectivity to ensure equitable, comprehensive, high-speed access to library and information resources, regardless of geographic location, economic circumstances, or size of community.

The means for attaining the goal of this project include providing matching grants to libraries for initial or upgraded Internet access, computer equipment, and/or initial or upgraded library automation systems. This project will address the issues of minimum information technology requirements and adequate statewide connectivity through broadband, high-speed access. This project will establish a process for statewide information technology planning, taking into account local library technology plans and leveraging future participation in the Gates Foundation U. S. Public Library Project and current technology grants using federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds for public libraries and consortia that include public libraries.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | FY2002 | FY2003 | Future | Total |
|-----------------|------------|------------|---------|------------|
| Grants | \$ 250,000 | \$ 250,000 | ongoing | \$ 500,000 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ 250,000 | \$ 250,000 | 0 0 | \$ 500,000 |
| (General Funds) | | | | |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 5.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 2.0 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 4.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 2.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 26 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Strengths/Weaknesses:

- The need is well-outlined but the expected outcomes are not defined in any detail
- Information about the project's impact needs to be defined more clearly and a justification for proceeding with the project in this
 manner needs to be made.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 34-03

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Library Commission | Nebraska's e-Library: Training | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Nebraska's e-Library: Training project addresses the need for improved information technology and training opportunities for Nebraska library personnel, with emphasis on networked information services, and the skills needed to utilize online information resources. Assessment of library personnel skills and abilities will define the content needs for workshops and training opportunities. These needs will be met through workshops, online tutorials and mini-courses, and through selected local, regional, and national resources that meet those needs. Training and educational opportunities for library staff will be developed and identified to ensure that every library in Nebraska has skilled and knowledgeable staff to meet citizen information needs. Competitive grant funds will be provided to achieve these objectives.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | FY2002 | FY2003 | Future | Total |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|---------|------------|
| Grants | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | ongoing | \$ 100,000 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$ 50,000 | \$ 50,000 | | \$ 100,000 |
| (General Funds) | | | | |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 5.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 3.3 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 10.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 5.0 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.7 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 34 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

This project would have scored better if more information had been provided.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 51-01

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|------------------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|
| University of Nebraska | Public Service/Engagement | \$ 300,000 | \$ 300,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

A total of \$1.5 million, requested in the operating budget at a level of \$750,000 in each year of the biennium, will improve the University's service to and engagement with Nebraska citizens. A portion (\$300,000 per year) of this request is being brought forward as a technology request because it proposes a stronger partnership among the agencies and educational entities or organizations that play important roles in daily lives of the citizens of the State of Nebraska. Significant portions of these roles involve utilization of or interaction via emerging digital technologies.

Citizens, businesses, and communities are still seeking solutions and resources to keep current on the rapidly changing Information Technologies (IT). The *Technologies Across Nebraska Initiative* (in response to Legislative Resolution 330) provides additional focus in addressing technology access equitably and increases reliable educational resources. The University will provide one of the leadership roles (with about 40 other involved entities). NU has the knowledge and track record to help reduce the digital divide among Nebraska citizens and the desire to work with all the partners. Much work has already been done by many. But citizen feedback continues to indicate that enough is not yet being done. Communities are feeling left behind, businesses still are seeking IT knowledge especially in marketing, IT strategies and positioning in the digital world. The emphasis of this project is on providing information to our citizens so that they can effectively incorporate technology into building community, business and personal opportunities. This request is not for equipment, but for *creating an environment for learning about what all this equipment and wiring and networks and web sites are all about.*

The NITC Community Council has identified fifteen areas that are in need of significant attention by the various IT supporters, educators, vendors and organizations. These include community leadership development and IT planning, economic development, E-commerce, agriculture, access to IT, education, libraries, health care, IT training, IT infrastructure choices, E-government, law enforcement and funding strategies. This proposal acknowledges those needs and introduces a partnership initiative focused upon meeting them.

The Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources will play a leadership role in developing collaborative opportunities throughout the NU system and among the Initiative partners. This grass-roots connected organization possesses the critical resources and experience needed to continually interact and receive feedback from those served, to ensure that programs are addressing the needs and issues of Nebraska citizens.

For this project, we've defined two areas -- Entrepreneurship through Connectivity and A Focus on Economic Viability -- as the two complementary programmatic areas in need of additional support. They comprise the foundations of this project request, shaping the thrust around two vital business and community needs. While listed as two components, their integration and mutual development is essential.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | | F1 2002 | F1 2003 |
|----------------------------|-----|---------------|-----------|
| Research/Coop Ext. Faculty | 4.0 | \$211,000 5.0 | \$229,500 |
| Retirement | | 12,554 | 13,655 |
| OASDI | | 16,022 | 17,407 |
| Life Ins. | | 120 | 150 |
| Health Ins. | | 14,000 | 17,500 |

Operating expenses are needed for materials and basic operations:

| Operating | \$ 46,304 | \$ 21,788 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| TOTAL | \$300,000 | \$300,000 |

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 5.7 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 3.0 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 6.7 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 6.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 3.3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 32 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Strengths:

- This proposal identifies several NITC initiatives relating to planning for the strategic use of Information Technology to foster and promote community development and economic viability. Specifically, the project seeks to develop and deliver educational content and consulting services to assist localities and individuals in the identification of opportunities and to develop technology initiatives to respond to these opportunities.
- If successful, the project would provide a benefit for community technical infrastructure decisions.

- Although the project speaks of the development of, and access to, educational program content, this process is not detailed in the request.
- The narrative does not provide a business plan for the development of the educational content; it does not contemplate a governance structure between the University and its Initiative Partners to protect against the non-cooperative risk; it does not propose a source of continued and on-going funding; nor does it describe the requirements necessary to deliver the course content which is to be developed.
- Technical impact-- The proposal does not call for the development or installation of IT.
- No estimates are given of the duration or scope of the program content to be delivered under either the Entreprenueurship Through Connectivity, nor the Focus on Rural Economic Viability.
- Financial analysis-- The use of the remaining \$900,000 is not covered in the technical documentation. The project proposal would have been much stronger if the entire program would have been presented. Without an understanding of the scope of the project, some estimate of the deliverables, and some estimate of content, it is impossible to determine if the budget is sufficient to fund the program.
- Scope and outcomes--Beneficiaries and their needs should be better defined. Expected outcomes as written are not specific
 and measurable.
- Project justification--The project fails to demonstrate the "need" for community information technology training.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

Project # 51-02

| Agency | Project | FY2002 | FY2003 |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| University of Nebraska | Extended/Distance Education | \$ 1,975,000 | \$ 1,975,000 |

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The University of Nebraska requests \$1,975,000 in each year of the 2001-2003 biennium to build distance education courses. The request is adequate only to deliver a limited number of courses annually. The University is building distance education courses now, and has identified needs that far exceed this request. However, this request would boost activity.

Recent surveys indicate that there is demand for and interest in distance education in Nebraska and beyond our borders. Our vision is one of delivering programs and providing opportunities to the citizens of Nebraska as well as others, regardless of location. We are building on areas of academic strength and using the latest available, cost-effective technology to deliver high quality distance learning courses so that learners can attain degrees, enhance careers or achieve professional development. The activities and needs outlined in this request are all essential to the success of distance education course development and delivery.

FUNDING SUMMARY

| | | FY 2002 | | FY 2003 |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---------------|-----|-----------|
| Faculty (Grants) | | \$250,000 | | \$250,000 |
| Managerial/Professional 5.0 | | 250,000 | 3.0 | 150,000 |
| Retirement | | 29,750 | | 23,800 |
| OASDI | | 38,100 | | 30,225 |
| Life Ins. | | 150 | | 375 |
| Health Insurance | | <u>17,500</u> | | 10,500 |
| | | | | |
| Total | 5.0 | \$585,500 | 3.0 | \$464,900 |
| | | | | |
| Travel for Faculty Development | | \$ 45,961 | | \$ 50,000 |
| | | | | |
| Operating and Capital Outlay reques | sts incl | ude: | | |
| Capital Outlay | | \$ 371,039 | \$ | 371,039 |
| Operating | | \$ 972,500 | \$ | 1,089,061 |
| | | | | |

PROJECT SCORE

| | Score | Maximum Possible |
|--|-------|---------------------|
| Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes | 6.3 | 10 |
| Section V: Project Justification / Business Case | 4.3 | 10 |
| Section VI: Implementation | 3.7 | 10 |
| Section VII: Technical Impact | 8.0 | 10 |
| Section VIII: Risk Assessment | 6.7 | 8 |
| Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget | 2.0 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 31 | 53 |

REVIEWER COMMENTS

- Scope and outcomes--This section is vague and marginally defined.
- Business case-- This proposal lacked specifics to make a valid business case.
- The need for the project is intuitive but there is a lack of detail concerning what the needs are and how they will be addressed by this proposal.
- The project description indicates that there will be a potential impact on procedures, staffing costs, and funding as faculty will be expected to create distance education courses and certain standards need to be met to ensure the courses meet academic standards.

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet

- Implementation--There is no detail concerning what the deliverables would be or what the timelines would be. It is indicated elsewhere that there will be a need for faculty support and training but it wasn't addressed in this section. The proposal fails to state how it fits with the University's investment of \$421,000 in the Midwest Higher Education Consortium's (MHEC) Distributed Learning Workshop, a collaborative effort to develop modules of computer-mediated instructional materials that can be shared among multiple university partners.